37076

Studies in Campū Literature

By
C. R. DESHPANDE
Department of Sanskrit,
University of Poona,
Poona

Bharatiya Vidya Prakashan

DELHI VARANASI

(INDIA)

Published by :
BHARATIYA VIDYA PRAKASHAN
1. I.U.B, Jawaharnagar, Bungalow Road, Delhi-110007.
2. P. Box 1108. Kachauri Gali, Varanasi-221001.

015,7
-N92

First Edition, 1992
Price : Rs. 400.00
ISBN—81-217-0039-6

RASHTRIYA SANSKRIT VIDYAPEETHA
LIBRARY, TIRUPATI.
(DEEMED UNIVERSITY)
Acc. No. 37076
Cl. No. 015,7 -N92

Printed by :
Arun Composing Agency, D-102, New Seelampur, Delhi-110053

CHAPTER I

Campū : A Literary Form

Before attempting to deal with any subject, it is necessary to define it in clear terms, so that there may not be any ambiguity about its scope. Many definitions of Campū have been attempted by rhetorician's We have to consider if they give an adequate idea of Campū, apply to all the available works of the type and make distinction between Campū and other forms of literary composition, that resemble it in one way or another. If they are found to be inadequate, we shall have to attempt a new definition ; but before doing that, it will be necessary to study the structure of Campū and the points that differentiate it from other forms of composition. When both these positive and negative aspects of Campū have been thoroughly examined, it will be convenient to state our own definition.

Sanskrit rhetoricians have defined Campū[1] as an admixture of prose and verse. Daṇḍin (6th Cent. A.D.), the earliest author to define Campū, says :—

---

1. The word is also spelt as Campu, with the ending 'u' short. e.g.

तच्चम्पुदम्मजलजेन समुज्जजृम्भे । पुरुदेवचम्पू of अर्हद्दास

(13th Cent. A.D)

यः काण्डान्निबबन्ध चम्पुविषयान्पञ्चापि भोजः कविः ।

उत्तररामचरितचम्पू of वेंकटाध्वरिन्

(17th Cent. A.D.)

निर्मातिं धर्माभ्युदयराजसूयसम्पन्नयं सम्प्रति चम्पुकाव्यम् ।

राजसूय प्रबन्ध of नारायण

(17th Cent. A.D.)

गद्यपद्यमयी काचिच्चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते ।
(काव्यादर्श—१-३१)

The Agnipurāṇa, which presumably belongs to a much later date, defines Campū as

मिश्रं चम्पुरिति ख्यातम् ।
(अग्नि. ३३६-३०)

In the opinion of Bhoja (11th Cent. A.D.) :—

याऽऽख्यायिकेव सोच्वछासा दिव्यपद्यगद्यमयी ।
सा दमयन्तीवासवदत्तादिरिहोच्यते चम्पूः ॥

Hemacandra (12th Cent. A.D.) states :—

गद्यपद्यमयी साङ्का सोच्वछासा चम्पूः ।
(काव्यानुशासन ८ पृ० ३४०)

Vāgbhaṭa (14th Cent. A.D.) gives an identical definition.

Viśvanātha and Vidyānātha(both of the 14th Cent. A.D.) in the Sāhityadarpaṇa and Pratāparudrayaśobhūṣaṇa respectively define Campū as :

गद्यपद्यमयं काव्यं चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते ।
(साहित्यदर्पण ६.३३६, प्रतापरुद्रयशोभूषण पृ० ९६)

ŚRIKṚṢṆA (Circa 1600 A.D.) repeats the same definition in his Mandāramaranda-Campū with a slight alteration viz.,

गद्यपद्यात्मकं काव्यं चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते ।
(मन्दारमरन्दचम्पू पृ० १८६)

Someśvara, the Calukya King, (14th Cent. A.D.) after dealing with Gadyakāvyas and Mahākāyas, thus describes Campū in his Mānasollāsa, also known as Abhilaṣitārthacintāmani ;—

प्राणैषीद् गुरुराजचम्पुमनघैर्गद्यैश्च पद्यैः शुभैः ।
—गुरुराजचम्पू of वरद
(19th Cent. A.D.) 178 a.

भद्रगिरिचम्पुरित्थं रचिता रघुनायकप्रसादाय ।
—भद्राचलचम्पू of राघवाचार्य
(Date unkown) II 37 cd

1. Edited by K.P. Trivedi, Bombay, 1909.
2. Kavyamala 52, Nirnayasagar Press, Bombay 1924.

गद्यं : पद्यं : समायुक्तामेतद्वर्णनकर्युताम् ।[1]

चम्पुनाम्ना समाख्यातां शुश्रूषेत महीपतिः ॥ (मानसोल्लास II p. 183)[2]

Kanticandra Bandopadhyāya (19th Cent. A.D.) is the next person to attempt a definition of Campū which he does as :—

गद्यपद्यमयं मिश्रं चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते । (काव्यदीपिका ४ पृ० ३२)[3]

The Śabdakalpadruma, published in 1889 A.D. has nothing more to say on Campū than—

चम्पूः, स्त्री, काव्यविशेषः । इति जटाधरः । तल्लक्षणं यथा—

गद्यपद्यमयी वाणी चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते । इति साहित्यदर्पणे ।६।२९८.

All these authorities are agreed that Campu consists of prose and verse intermingled; but they do not state—clearly the features in which Campu is different from—other classes of composition, that also contain such mixture The Atharvaveda, the Yajurveda, the Brāhmaṇas, some Upaniṣads (e.g. the Chāndogya, the Bṛhadāraṇyaka, the Kena, the Kaṭha etc.), the Ādi, Vana and Śānti Parvans of the Mahābhārata, the Bhāgavata and the Viṣṇu Purāṇas, Fable literature like the Pañcatantra and the Hitopadeśa, the Lalitavistara, the Jātakamālā, dramatic works, some inscriptions, prose romances and the Yogavāsiṣṭha, have prose and verse intermingled. If mere mixture of prose and verse is deemed sufficient to make a literary work a Campū, the above mentioned works will have to be classified as Campū works; but that is never done.

Daṇḍin, who gives the earliest known definition of Campū, appears to be aware of this difficulty, as he uses the word 'Kācit' suggesting thereby that each and every work containing a commingling of prose and verse may not necessarily be called a Campū.[4]

---

1. i.e. Gadyakāvya and Mahākāvya.
2. Gaekwad's Oriental Series LXXXIV, Baroda, 1939
3. Calcutta 1870
4. Vide - काचिदिति न तु सर्वा । तेन गद्यपद्यमय्या राजस्तुतेर्विरुद—

संज्ञाऽभ्यैरुक्ता ज्ञातव्या ;

—Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa (19th Cent. A.D.) on the Kavyādarśa 1-31 cd-Bibliotheca India, Calcutta, 1863 p 29.

and also काचिदित्युक्त्वा सर्वो गद्यपद्यमयः प्रबन्धश्चम्पूर्भवितुं नार्हति । तादृशप्रबन्धस्य राजस्तुतौ विरुदसंज्ञाभावात् ।

Raṅgācārya Raḍi (20th Cent. A.D.) Kavyādarśa, Bori, Poona, 1938, p. 31.

Bhoja maintains that a Campū is written only in—Sanskrit (**divyagadyapadyamayī**) and that it resembles an Ākhyāyikā in as much as it is divided into Ucchvāsas.

In addition to these two points mentioned by Bhoja, Hemcandra lays down one more point of information i.e. a Campū generally contains some watchward, either the poet's name or other name.

Viśvanātha, Vidyānātha and Śrīkṛṣṇa deem it necessary that Campū be a poetic composition (*Kāvyam*) of the mixed type.

Someśvara merely gives an idea of the contents of Campū and has nothing special to say about its form

Kānticandra Bandopādhyāya and *the Śabdakalpadruma* have failed to catch the point and their definitions need not be further considered.

By putting together all the material available in the definitions suggested by various rhetoricians from Daṇḍin to Viśvanātha a workable definition of Campū can be formed as follows :—

Some poetic compostion, written in Sanskrit, consisting of a mixture of prose and verse, divided into Ucchvāsas, generally marked by some watchword, the poet's name or some other name and having for their subject-matter topics dealt with in Gadya-kāvyas and Mahākāvyas are called Campūs.

This defition lays down five essential and one optional features of Campū. They are :

i) A Campū must be a poetic composition.
ii) It must be written in Sanskrit.
iii) It must consist of a mixture of prose and verse.
iv) It must be divided into Ucchvāsas.
v) It must have for its subject matter topics dealt with in Gadyakāvyas and Mahākāvyas, and,
vi) It may be marked by some watchward, poet's name or some other name.

It has to be seen now whether all these requirements are obligatory and must be fulfilled before a work can qualify itself for the title Campū.

i) A Campū must be a poetic composition. The difficulty of distinguishing Campū from other forms of literary composition consisting of prose and verse commingled has been referred to above. Daṇḍin, though aware of the difficulty, has not been successful in finding a way out. The word 'Kāciṭ' in his definition at best conveys a negative sense and says nothing positive.

Viśvanātha, Vidyānātha and Śrīkṛṣṇa by the pertinent employment of the word 'kāvya' give a justification for the exclusion of a great number of works from the long list given above; for the *Atharvaveda*, the *Yajurveda*, the *Brāhmaṇas*, the *Upaniṣads* etc. are not 'kāvyas'—whatever else they may be. But dramatic works and prose romances are kāvyas and they are 'gadyapadyamaya'. though there is only a moderate sprinkling of verse in the prose romances. What additional features are required to make a kāvya a Campū will be seen later on. It is poetic in form.

But every rule has some exceptions. There do exist some Campūs that can hardly be called 'kāvyas', however the scope of the term be extended. The *Mandāramarandacampū* of Śrīkṛṣṇa (ciraca 1600 A.D.) in spite of its own definition that Campū is a kāvya of mlxed type, gives only illustrations of various metres and various kinds of śleṣas and though the illustrations in Bindus I to III make a connected story, the composition is not poetic at all. The *Vidvanamodatarangini* of Cirañjiva (17th Cent A.D.) possesses at least the kāvyaguṇa prasāda but the *Tattarguṇādarśacampū* of Annayārya (date unknown) discussing whether Śiva or Viṣṇu is superior, is dry as dust and while discussing Upaniṣadic passages reminds one of the *Śribhāṣya* of Rāmānuja. The work can be better styled a theoiogical treatise than a campū, but its author himself insists on calling it so.

ii) A campū must be written in Sanskrit. This condition does not apply universally, as campus are available in Kannada right from the tenth century A.D.[1] The *Ādi*

1. *Kanarese Literature*. E.P. Rice. The Heritage of India Series 1915, p. 27 and also *the Heritage of Karnataka* by Dr. R.S. Mugali, Bangalore 1946 p. 183.

Purāṇa and the *Pampa Bhārata* of Pampa, the earliest of the Kannada campūs were composed in 941 A.D. only a few years after the *Nalacampū* of Trivikrama, the earliest of the exant Sanskrit campūs. Campūs are also known to be existing in Telugu.[1] The *Vaṁśabhākaracampū* of Suryamalla, a bard at the Court of Rajasiṁha of Bundi (19th Cent. A.D.)[2] has been composed in a variety of languages like Sanskrit. Prākṛta, Māgadhī, Paiśācī,—Piṅgala, Diṅgala, Hindi etc. The *Sārasvatacampū* of—Kākodakara (20th Cent. A.D.)[3] is perhaps the only campū in Marathi.

iii) A campū must consist of a mixture of prose and verse. It has been noted above that, though the word 'kāvya' employed by Viśvanātha, Vidyānātha and Srīkṛṣṇa comes to eliminate a large number of works, that consist of a mixture of prose and verse, dramatic works and prose romances still present a difficulty as they possess the feature of being mixed poetical compositions. Campū is a 'śravya kāvya' and hence can easily be distinguished from dramatic works which are 'dṛśya kāvyas'.[4] The prose romances have a few verses scattered in their bodies in addition to the Maṅgala stanzas e.g. the *Kādambarī* (1 verse in the Pūrvabhāga) the *Harṣacarita* (14 verses), the *Daśakumāracarita* (1 verse in the Purvapīṭhikā and 2 in the text proper), the *Vāsavadattā* of Subandhu (7 verse), the *Tilakāmañjarī* of Dhanapāla (37 verses), the—*Gadyacintāmaṇi* of Vādībhasimha ( ), the *Vemabhūpālacarita* of Vāmanabhaṭṭabāṇa (3 verses).

Earlier commentators on the rhetoricians quoted above do not help us in deciding this point.[4] Premacandra Tarkavāgiśa (19th

1. RAJU P.T. : Telugu Literature.
2. Introduction to the Nalacampū by Nanda Kishora Sarma Kashi Sanskrit Series No. 98. Benares, 1932 P. 7 fn.
3. Madgaon, 1934.
4. Even then there are some Campūs that have some common points with dramas. These similarities have been noted in a subsequent section.
5. pp. 3 and 4 of this Thesis.

Samarapuṅgava Dīkṣita (14th Cent. A.D.) says in his *Tīrthayātrāprabandhacampū* :—

पद्येषु बाहुल्यमिह प्रबन्धे मितानि गद्यानि तु—

(Ibid I-11 ab)

Dhanapāla, the author of the prose romance *Tilakamañjarī* (11th Cent. A D.) observes :—

अश्रान्तगद्यसन्ताना श्रोतृणां निर्विदे कथा।
जहाति पद्यप्रचुरा चम्पूरपि कथारसम् ॥
(तिलकमञ्जरी श्लो० १७)[1]

Generally a campū has more than 50 per cent verse and the remaining prose. The *Koṭvirahacampū* of Nārāyaṇabhaṭṭa (17th Cent. A.D.) has only two phrases तस्मिन्नेव समये after verse 2 and इति बहुविधविकल्पदोलारूढे कान्ते सा तु after verse 85 in prose. The *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū* of Veṅkaṭādhvarin (17th Cent. A.D.) has more than 75 per cent of its bulk in verse.

This brings us to another pecularity of Campū. Prose and verse have no separate provinces of their own. Their use is indiscriminate. As Dr. S.K. DE puts it, "The verse is not always specifically reserved for an important idea, a poetic description, an impressive speech, a pointed moral or a sentimental outburst, but even for ordinary narrative and description verse is as much pressed into service as prose"[2] Dr. L. Sarup observes on this same point. "In a campū.....the story is partly in prose and partly in verse, neither prose nor verse being of any special importance. In a campū, the verse is not a peg on which the prose is hung but serves the purpose of a woof in which the prose is a warp."[3]

Prose and verse are employed here side by side for the purpose of narration, description, conversation and moralisation.

---

1. Kavyamālā 85, Nirṇayasāgara, Press, Bombay, 1903.
2. JGJRI I i p. 56 and History of Classical Sanskrit literature by DE and Dasgupta, Calcutta 1947 p. 434.
3. Introduction to the *Varadambikaparinayacampū* Ed. by Dr. L. Sarup, Lahore, p. 15.

RSVL 37076

015,7
-N92

iv) A campū must be divided into Ucchvāsas. The *Nalacampū* of Trivikrama (10th Cent. A.D.), the earliest of the extant campūs, is divided into seven Ucchvāsas. The *Udayasundarīkathā* of Soddhala (11th Cent. A.D.), has eight ucchvāsas. The *Gaṅgāvataraṇacampū* of Śaṅkara Dīkṣita (18th Cent. A.D.), the Aniruddhācaritacampū of Devarāja (date unknown) and the *Jayarāmacaritacampū* of Mādhava Bhaṭṭa (date unknown) are some more campūs the chapters of which are called ucchvāsas.

But the divisions of campūs are not invariably called ucchvāsas. The *Yasastilakacampū* of Somadeva (10th Cent. A.D.), the second in antiquity among the available campūs, calls its sections by the name 'Āsvāsa'. The *Jīvandharacampū* of Haricandra, assigned to the 10th Century A.D. is divided into Lambas. The Rāmāyaṇacampū of Bhoja (11th Cent, A.D.), styles its chapters Kāṇḍas in the manner of Vālmīki. Other names employed by campū authors to designate the divisions of their works are Stabaka (The भारतचम्पू of अनन्तभट्ट, के पुरुदेव भाग, अमि, भारत); Ullās. कविमनो, श्रीनिवासविलास. मद्रकन्या. राधा.), Puraṇa (The बालभागवतचम्पू of पद्मराज and the कृष्णभूषण of नरसिंह)., Kolāhala (The आचार्यदिग्विजय of वरदाम्बु. बाणासुरवि०) etc.

Some campūs like the *Viśvaguṇādarśacampū* of Veṅkaṭādhvarin (17th Cent. A.D.) and the *Citracampū* of Bāṇeśvara (18th Cent. A.D.), though large enough to admit of a division into Chapters, form a single whole. Perhaps the nature of their subject matter was such as would not countenance a division. Some campūs like the *Prabandhas* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa are too small for a division.

Hence this condition, viz., that campūs must be divided into ucchvāsas does not command universal application and may be dispensed with.

(v) A campū must have for its subject matter topics dealt with in Gadyakāvyas and Mahākāvyas

Sanskrit rhetoricians have given long lists of the topics that have to be dealt with in Gadyakāvyas and Mahākāvyas.[1] Almost

1. Daṇḍin (Kāvyādarśa I 14-20), Bhoja (Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa V 128 ff), Agnipurāṇa (337.24.32), Viśvanātha (Sāhityadarpaṇa VI 315 cd to 325 ab), Vidyānātha (Pratāprudrayaśobhūṣaṇa p 96), Īśana Saṃhitā and Kāvyālaṅkāra (I 19 ff).

RASHTRIYA SANSKRIT VIDYAPEETHA
LIBRARY, TIRUPATI.
(DEEMED UNIVERSITY)
Acc. No. 37076
Cl. No.

everything from the flora and fauna, natural phenomena and human civilization is included and the poet has abundant opportunities to exhibit his intimate knowledge of nature and the innermost workings of human heart. Campū authors have handled almost every topic from the list. As a matter of fact no poet desirous of embelishing his composition can dispense with them. In a subsequent section dealing with the comparison between campū on the one hand and Gadya kāvya and Mahākāvya on the other, this point of the common subject matter of Campū and Gadyakāvya and Mahākāvya has been discussed.

vi) A campū may be marked by some watchward, the poet's name or some other name. Only a few campūs fulfil this requirement. The *Nalacampū* of Trivikrama (10th Cent. A.D.) the *Udayasundarīkathā* of Soḍḍhala (11th Cent. A.D.), the first half of the *Śrīnivāsavilāscampū* of Veṅkaṭādhwarin (17th Cent. A.D.), the *Gaṅgāvataraṇacampū* of Śaṅkara Dīkṣita (18th Cent. A.D.), the *Aniruddhacaritacampū* of Devarāja,, the *Jayarāmacaritacampū* of Mādhavabhaṭṭa (the last two of uncertain dates) contain the words Haracaraṇasaroja, Sārasvataśri, Śrīnivāsa, Gaṅgā, Sukha and Praṇayimādhava respectively in the last verses of their chapters.[1] Of these the Jayarāmacarita is marked by the author's name.

Excepting these, there are no other Campūs possessing any watchward. The *Yasastilakacampū* of Somadeva (10th Cent. A.D.) the *Jīvandharacampū* of Haricandra (assigned to the 10th Cent. A.D.), the *Rāmāyaṇacampū* of Bhoja (11th Cent. A.D.), the *Bhāgavatacampū* of Abhinavakālidāsa (11th Cent. A.D.), the *Bhāratacampū* of Anantabhaṭṭa (15th Cent. A.D.), the *Nīlakaṇṭhavijayacampū* of Nīlakaṇṭha (16th Cent. A.D.), to mention only a few prominent campūs, have no watchward at all. Hence this practice of introducing a watchaward also, not being much popular with campū authors, may be left out of consideration while noting the essentials of campū.

---

1. It may be incidentally pointed out that these campūs having watchward do not necessarily call their divisions ucchvāsas.

Thus after a careful investigation, it has been seen that out of the requirements laid down for campū, only Nos. i, iii. and v hold good and that Nos. ii, iv, and vi are not indispensable, though they may be found in the case of some campūs.

Hence the definition of campū would now appear to be as "A campū is a poetic composition, consisting of a mixture of prose and verse employed indiscriminately and having for its subject matter topics dealt with in Gadyakāvyas and Mahākāvyas.

This definition is clear enough so far as the distinctive characteristics of campū are concerned, but it gives no idea about some technical points as the magnitude of campū etc. Hence the struc- of campū has to be carefully studied.

THE STRUCTURE OF CAMPŪ

Someśvara, the author of the *Mānasollāsa* (14th Cent. A.D.) has disposed of many points important so far as the structure of Campū is concerned, by one single remark that this form of composition treats of all topics that are dealt with in Gadyakāvya and Mahākāvya[1]. Hence it goes without saying that the hero of a campū must possess noble qualities.[2] The *Nalacampū*, the earliest of the known campus, emphasises this point in a verse in its introductory portion.[3]

The sentiment developed is mainly the erotic as in the campūs on Kṛṣna and the various campūs based on love stories. The heroic also predominates in some cāmpūs e g. the stabaka dealing with the war in the *Bhāratacampū* of Ananta Bhaṭṭa (14th Cent. A.D.) the *Varadāmbikāpariṇaya* of Tirumalāmbā (15th Cent. A.D.) the *Mādhavacampū* of Cirañjiva Bhaṭṭācārya (18th Cent. A.D.) etc. In the Jaina campūs and campūs on the great teachers like the *Rāmānujacampū* of Rāmānujadāsa, Śānta is the Chief sentiment. The remaining sentiments may come in subordinate as occasions arise, but they are never principal, e.g.

---

1. Op. Cit. p. 5
2. धीरोदात्तगुणान्वितः ।
3. उदात्तनायकोपेता गुणवद् वृत्तमुक्तका ।
   चम्पूश्च हारयष्टिश्च केन न क्रियते हृदि । उ. १ श्लो० २५.

रौद्र :— यश० १, नृसिंह ४
हास्य :—नीलकण्ठ १, १२, १३, भारत १
भयानक :—यश० १, नीलकण्ठ ४, उदय० ५, जीवन्धर १, अजामिल
बीभत्स : - यश० १
अद्भुत :—उदय० २, ३, चित्र१ दत्तात्रेय १
शान्त : यश० ६, ८, दत्तात्रेय १

As regards the magnitude of campū, there is a great diversity. The smallest campūs those of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (17th Cent. A.D.), like the *Kārtavīryavijayaprabandha*, the *Rukmāṅgadacarita*, the *Kucelvṛttaprabandha*, the *Tripuradahana* etc. hardly exceed thirty Granthas, while the *Yasastilakccampū* of Somadeva (10th Cent. A.D.), the *Ānandvṛndavana* of Karṇpūra (16th Cent. A.D.), the *Gopalacampū* of Jivaraja (16th Cent. A.D.), are some of the huge campūs that run into more than 10,000 Granthas. Most of the campūs, however—lie betwern these two extrems and consist of 700 to 1500 Granthas.

The beginning and the end of a campū have much in common with those of a Gadyakāvya, as will be clear when campū is compared to these forms of composition. It may be remarked here that campūs ordinarily end with some happy incident in the hero's life. The Bhāgavatacampū of Abhinavakālidasa (11th Cent. A.D.) ends with Kṛṣna propitiating Rukumiṇī. Later incidents in Kṛṣṇa's life leading to the destruction of the Yādavas are not described. *Bhāratacampū* of Ananta Bhaṭṭa (15th Cent. A.D.) concludes with Yudhiṣṭhira's coronation; incidents in the the Āśramavāsika, Mausala, Mahāprāsthānika and Svargārohaṇa Parvans were perhaps considered to be too tragic to end the campū with.

Further points regarding the structure of Campū will be clear in the comparison of this form with kindred forms of literary composition.

CAMPŪ AND MAHĀKĀVYA

The *Yaśastilakacampū* of Somadeva (10th Cent. A.D.), only next to the *Nalacampū* of Trivikrama in point of antiquity, is called a Mahākāvya. It would appear that both the author and

the commentator (date unknown) called it a Mahākāvya as the colophons of the text and the commentary run as :

यशोधरमहाराजचरिते यशस्तिलकापरनाम्नि महाकाव्ये

and यशोधरमहाराजचरितचम्पूमहाकाव्यटीकायाम् respectively

Many characteristics of Mahākāvya are found in campū. A Mahākāvya begins with a benediction, or obeissance to the poet's favourite deity or with a direct reference to the subject matter. So also do the campūs. e.g.

आशिस्:—कुमार., चित्र., जीव., दत्तात्रेय., द्रौपदी., पुरुदेव., मद्रकन्या भाग., (अभि.,) भाग., (चिदम्बर)., भाग., (राज)., वीरभद्र.

नमस्क्रिया:—आ., वृ., उदय., कविमनो., चोल., नल., नीलकण्ठ., भद्राचल., मीनाक्षीकल्याण , मदालसा., मार्गसहाय., लघुगोपाल., विबुधानन्द.

वस्तुनिर्देश :—त्रिपुरदहन., नृगमोक्ष., वरदाम्बि., सन्तानगोपाल.

Like Mahākāvyas campūs are sometimes divided into sections and in the case of the Bhāgavatacampū of Padmarāja the sections are called Sargas. As the sargas of Mahākāvyas are sometimes named after their contents, so are the sections of some campūs e.g.

यशस्तिलकचम्पू, जीवन्धरचम्पू, उदयसुन्दरीकथा, शिवचरित्रचम्पू, जयरामचरित्र, गङ्गाचम्पू, पुरुषोत्तमचम्पू, उर्वीधरचम्पू, लघुगोपालचम्पू etc.

Sargas of Mahākāvyas generally consist of verses in uniform metres, a different metre being used in the concluding verse or verses. In campūs there is a variety of metres employed in the sections, which do not necessarily end with a verse.

Most of the topics enumerated by Daṇḍin and Viśvanātha as forming the bulk of Mahākāvyas are to be met with in campūs also e.g.

Cities :—कविमनो., गङ्गा., चोल. यश. I, भारत I, पुरुदेव, भैष्मी, चम्पूमण्डन

Oceans :—वरदाम्बिका. अनिरुद्ध, मद्रकन्या

Mountain :—गङ्गा २ कुमार. १. नल. ५ शङ्करमन्दार १, शङ्करविलास १

Moonrise :—नल ७., दत्तात्रेय १ चोल. राधामाधव ५, मार्गसहाय ४

Sunrise—श्रीनिवास., पू. ३. उर्वीधर ७, रामचन्द्रचरित २.

Sunset :—जयरामचरित्र., २., उदय., ५., दत्तात्रेय १, मदालसा ५.

Collection of flowers :—वरदा. १४०, १४८, जीवन्धर ४

Water sports :—वरदाम्बिका. १४८, १५३. उर्वीधर ७ जीवन्धर ४ भारत ३.

Drinking booths :—विरुपाक्ष. अभिनवरामायण १

Love sports :—विरुपाक्ष. कोटिविरह. भाग. (अभि.) ३. दत्तात्रेय १

Mantra :—अनिरुद्ध ६ जीवन्धर १

Sending the messengers :—विरुपाक्ष. अनिरुद्ध ४ नल ७

Battles :—अभिनवरामायण १२ उर्वीधर ६ पारिजात ५ पुरुदेव १०

Seasons :—आ. वृ. १. जयराम. २. श्रीनिवास. पृ. १. गुरुराज.

Separation :—नल. १. भाग. (अभि.) ३. श्रीनिवास. पू. ३.

Marriage :—भारत. द्रौपदी ५. सीतापरिणय. पुरुषोत्तम गोदापरिणय ४

The hero of a Mahākāvya is required to be either a divine being or a Kṣatriya of a noble family whereas that of a campū may be a divine being e.g. Śiva as in the case of the *Nīlakaṇṭhavijaya* of Nīlakaṇṭha (16th Cent. A.D.), a Brahmin as in the case of the *Rāmānujacampū* of Rāmānujadāsa (Circa 1600 A D.) a Kṣatriya as in the case of the *Nalacampū* of Trivikrama (10th Cent. A.D.) a Vaiśya as in the *Kṛṣṇabhuṣaṇacampū* of Narasimha (date unknown), a Government Official as in the *Ānandaraṅgacampū* of Śrīnivāsa (18th Cent, A.D.) and even a Śudra as in the *Colacampū* of Virūpākṣa (date unknown). Kings of the same family have become the heroes of the *Raghuvaṁśa* of Kālidās. Teachers of the same family form the subject matter of the *Nāthamunivijayacampū* of Maitreya Rāmānujācarya (date unknown).

The hero of a campū, like that of a Mahākāvya must always be Dhīrodātta, in fact the receptacle of all desirable qualities conceivable.[1] Kālidāsa and Śrīharṣa dwell upon the merits of their heroes in the Raghuvaṁśa I and the Naiṣadhīyacarita I respectively Campū authors also are never tired of describing how their heroes surpass everybody e.g.

अनिरुद्ध	कर्ण
आनन्दरङ्गविजय	नल
उर्वीधर	यशस्तिलक
कुचेलवृत्त	वीरभद्र

1. This applies to the Gadyakāvyas also.

गङ्गावतरण श्रीनिवासविलास
चोल
चित्र

Mahākāvyas and many campūs depend upon indentical sources for their subject matter, The Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata, Purāṇas and the Jaina sacred works supply a great number of campū authors with their plots. Sometimes Mahākāvyas and campūs are found to have been written on identical topics. Indeed, the *Nalacampū*, the earliest of the available campūs, handles the story of Nala, which was undertaken by Srīharṣa for the purpose of composing a Mahākāvya. The *Kiratārjunīyacampū* of Devaraja (date unknown) has the same plot as the *Kiratārjunīya* of Bhāravi. The *Kumārsambhavacampū* of Sarabhoji (19th Cent. A.D.) is actually based on the *Kumārsambhava* of Kālidāsa.

CAMPŪ AND GADYAKĀVYA

Trivikrama, the earliest known campū author, calls his composition a Kathā.[1] His work, the *Nalacampū*, is also known by the other name *Damayantīkathā*. Soḍḍhala, another early campū author, has named his work, which he himself calls a campū, as the *Udayasundarīkathā*. Devarāja, the author of the *Aniruddhacarita* campū (date unkown) also calls his composition Kathā.[2]

Bhoja, the author of the gramatical work *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa*, in his Vṛtti on the Sūtra explaining the formation of the word campū, identifies campū with Kathā.[3]

Similarity between campū and Kathā does not stop with a mere name. There are many points of similarity. Viśvanātha lays down that in a Kathā there should be a description of the ways of the wicked after the traditional salutation to the author's favourite deity.[5] Some campūs follow this convention e.g.

---

1. सङ्गता सुरसार्थेन रम्या मे रुचिराश्रया।
   नन्दनोद्यानमालेव स्वस्थैरालोक्यतां कथा॥
2. नलचम्पू उ० १ श्लो० २४
3. दृम्भिचपोर्नुं च। २-१-१२४
   आभ्यामुप्रत्ययोनुमागमश्च भवति। दृम्भूः सर्पजातिः। चम्पूः कथा।
4. आदौ पद्यैर्नमस्कारः खलादेर्वृत्तकीर्तनम्।
   साहित्यदर्पण ६-३३२

अनिरुद्ध
आनन्दवृन्दावन
उदयसुन्दरी
गङ्गा
जयरामचरित
नल
यशस्तिलक
रामचन्द्रचरित etc.

Some campūs dwelt upon the exploits and prowess of the authors' patrons and may be said to resemble Akhyāyikās e.g. the *Virabhadradeva campū* of Padmanābha (16 Cent. A.D.), the *Varadāmbikāpariṇayacampū* of Tirumalāmba (16th Cent. A.D.), the *Radhāmadhavavilāsacampū* of Jayarāma (17th Cent. A.D.) etc. Viśvanātha point out that in an Ākhyāyikā, the poet should give his autobiography.[1] The following campūs fulfil this condition.

अनिरुद्ध
उदयसुन्दरी
जयरामचरित
द्रौपदीपरिणय
दिव्यचापविजय
नल
बाणासुरविजय
भैष्मीपरिणय
विद्वन्मोदतरङ्गिणी
वैकुण्ठविजय

To turn to the features common to Kathā and Ākhyāyikā both, appreciative stanzas on ancient poets form a part of their introductory portion as in the Harṣacarita, the Kādāmbarī of Bāṇabhaṭṭa and the Tilakamañjarī of Dhanpāla. We find such a phenomenon in some campūs also. e.g.

---

1. कवेर्वंशानुकीर्तनम् ।
साहित्यदर्पण ६-३३४

अनिरुद्ध
उदयसुन्दरी
गङ्गा
जयरामचरित
नल
शिवचरित्र

In Gadyakāvyas the authors sometimes state their ideas about model poetry, some campū authors do the same e.g.

गङ्गा
जयरामचरित
नल
नाथमुनि
यशस्तिलक
रामचन्द्रचरित

Some Gadyakāvyas contain Subhāṣita stanzas in the introductory verses though there is no conceivable occasion for them. So also do some campūs e.g.

उदयसुन्दरी
नल
भार्गव
यशस्तिलक
रामचन्द्रचरित

The divisions of some campūs are called Āśvasas or Ucchvāsas like those of Ākhyāyikā, e.g.

आश्वास	उच्छ्वास
यशस्तिलक	नल
कुमारसम्भव	पारिजात
द्रौपदीपरिणय	वीरभद्र
नीलकण्ठविजय	
मार्गसहाय	
मीनाक्षीकल्याण	
शिवचरित्र	

Viśvanātha says that verses in the Āryā, Vaktra and Aparavaktra metres are to suggest the plot in a chapter at its beginning.[1] We have not so far come across any campū in which this condition is fulfilled.

The styles of narration in Gadyakāvya and campū are identical. Most of the campūs are written in the prohibitive Gaudi style. There are a few campūs like the Pārijātaharaṇa-campū of Śeṣa Śrikṛṣṇa (16th Cent. A.D.), the Nīlkaṇṭhavijaya-campū of Nīlakaṇṭha (16th Cent. A.D.), the Viśvaguṇādarśacampū of Veṅkatādhvarin (17th Cent. A.D.), and the Prabandhas of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (17th Cent. A.D.) written in the most delightful Vaidarbhī style. A few campūs like the Śaṅkaravijaycampū of Jagannātha (18th Cent. A.D.) have been written in the flippant slipshod style.

The campū authors are much under the influence of Bāṇabhaṭṭa as will be shown in chapter 8 of this book.

It is possible to turn Gadyakāvyas into campūs by versifying portions in them. *The Abhinavakādambarīcampū* of Ahobala-ṇṛsiṁha (date unknown) is an instance in point.

CAMPŪ AND FABLE LITERATURE

One important common point between campū and Fable works, that will attract the attention of even a casual reader, is that both the forms contain an admixture of prose and verse. It will not at the same time escape notice that prose and verse fulfil distinct functions in Fable Works. Prose is used mainly for narration and verse employed for moralization. Verse very rarely, if at all, forms part of the narrative so that it is possible to dispense with it altogether and keep the story element undisturbed. In campū the verse forms part of the narration itself and cannot be omitted without seriously affecting the continuity of the plot.

The style of the Fable works is easy and simple. It has no poetic flashes. Narration of stories and driving home the instruc-

1. आर्याविक्रवापवक्त्राणां छन्दसा येन केन चित्
अन्यापदेशेनाश्वासमुखे भाव्यर्थसूचनम्
साहित्यदर्पण ६-३३५-३३६.

tion intended to be conveyed is the main business of the author. Fable works are singularly exempted from long compounds and obscure. out of the way words. The author carefully avoids the temptation to indulge in fanciful descriptions of everything under the sun. His narration is direct, matter of fact.

The campū authors appear to have undertaken the composition merely to make a show of their erudition and skill in playing acrobatics with language They leave the plot to take care of itself whenever they get an opportuaity to describe any object or occasion until the reader forgets what the main story is. They will never say anything in a clear and straightforward manner and utilize their ingenuity in all sorts of twists and twirls to the expression.

The authors of Fable works wanted to instruct raw youths into the ways of the world Hence there was no occasion for them to cultivate artificial style. They have stated in plain terms whatever they wanted to say. The campūs have been written in the decadent stage of Sanskrit Literature, when form was placed above matter, the way of presenting facts was given precedence over the facts themselves. The campū authors perhaps wanted to show they could handle both the means of expression—prose and verse with equal skill. They also wanted to parade their knowledge in different śāstras. Hence in campūs we find very little life and all artificiality, just opposite of what we find in the Fable works.

The characters in the Fable works are mostly lower animals like jackals, lions, oxen, bears, frogs, crocodiles, monkeys, crows, owls etc Sometimes there are human beings also and rarely superhuman beings or gods as in the stories of the ocean and the Ṭiṭṭibha and the carpenter and the princess in the Pañcatantra. Campūs mainly deal with human beings and sometimes with gods but rarely with lower animals. Of course in the Nalacampū of Trivikrama there is the swan that undertakes the mission of bringing together the lovers that had fallen in love with each other even before the first sight. There is very little superhuman element in campū. The only exception is the Udayasundarī-Kathā of Soḍḍhala in which the hero marries a serpent princess of the nether world.

But Fable works can be transformed into campūs. The Vikramasenacarita-campū of Nārāyaṇa (18th Cent. A.D.) is a metamorphosis of the first Vetāla of the Vetālapañcaviṁśati.

CAMPŪ AND DRAMA

In drama also verses are found interpersed with prose so that both these forms appear closely similar. The Śaṭhasamāgama-campū of Mathureśa Cakravartin (18th Cent. A.D.) has been called a campūnāṭaka in the colophon. The Viśvaguṇādarśa of Venkatādhvarin (17th Cent. A.D.) consists of a dialogue between two Gandharva friends, but its resemblence with drama goes no further. The Ānandlatikācampū of Kṛṣṇānātha (17th Cent. A.D.) has many stage directions but is mainly in the form of narration. The chamberlain in the Aniruddhacaritacampū of Devarāja (date unknown) complains of his old age as is customary with Chamberlains in Sanskrit dramas. But these are instances of the influence of drama on campū rather than those of common features between the two forms. A drama is to be visualised (dṛśyakāvya) and a campū to be heard (śravyakāvya). Hence there are very few similarities between the two. Dramas in the decadent stage degenarating into dramatic poems somewhat approach campūs.

Viśvanātha lays down that there must be all the Nāṭakasandhis in an ornate epic.[1] They are not found in campūs. In good dramas the plot is skilfully unfolded ; many threads are let loose in the earlier part and collected towards the end, so that there is hardly any useless detail. Insignificant objects casually mentioned in the early acts serve vitally important purposes in the end. e.g. the ring in the Abhijñānaśākuntala, the necklace in the Ratnāvalī etc. No such skill is found in campūs. Everything is gross and no subtlety is harboured.

CAMPŪ AND BIRUDA

Biruda is defined as :—

गद्यपद्यमयी राजस्तुतिर्बिरुदमुच्यते ।

(*Sahityadarpaṇa* Viśvanātha VI)

There are some campus like the *Urvīdharacampū* of Vibhakara and the *Karṇacampū* of Kakkābhaṭṭa containing many laudatory

1. सर्वे नाटकसन्धयः । सा. द. VI

verses purporting to be addressed to their heroes by various poets ; but in addition to these verses these campūs also have some passages in prose and verses describing the heroes' daily routine and some incidents that took place in their lives. This easily distinguishes between campū and Biruda.

Thus after examining definitions of Campū attempted by various rhetoricians. studying its structure and comparing and contrasting it with many other forms of literature, it is time to state our own definition. We hope to be allowed to do so on the lines on which Viśvanātha defines Mahākāvya in his Sāhityadarpaṇa :—

गद्यपद्यमयं काव्यं चम्पूरित्यभिधीयते ।
प्राचुर्यं तत्र पद्यस्य तत्प्रयोगोऽविशेषतः ॥१॥
गद्यकाव्यमहाकाव्यमिश्रणं विषये भवेत् ।
विभागा अभिधीयन्ते लम्ब आश्वासपूरणे ।
उच्छ्वासस्तबकोल्लास सर्गकोलाहलादयः ॥२॥
क्वचिदंशा इमे साङ्काः कवेरिच्छानुसारतः
कथानकस्य सन्दर्भाद् भागाः स्युः सामिधाः क्वचित् ॥३॥
विभागरहिता चम्पूरपि क्वचन दृश्यते ।
अंशानां नियता सङ्ख्या वक्तुं नैव च शक्यते ॥४॥
धीरोदात्तो नायकः स्यात् परिव्राङ् देवताऽथ वा ।
ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियो वैश्यः शूद्रो वा राजसेवकः ॥५॥
शृंगारवीरशान्तानां मुख्य एकतमो रसः ।
अवशिष्टा रसा येते सन्ति तत्रानुषाङ्गिणः ॥६॥
ग्रन्थेभ्यस्त्रिंशतो न्यूनो विस्तरो न कदाचन ।
ग्रन्था दशसहस्राणि चम्पवायामोऽस्ति च क्वचित् ॥७॥
शैली समासबहुला दुर्बोधपदसङ्कुला ।
वक्रोक्तिमाश्रिता प्रायस्तथाऽलङ्कारभूषिता ॥८॥

DERIVATION

Bhoja, the author of the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhabharaṇa a work on grammar (11th Cent. A.D.) has a sūtra to explain the form campū. It is—

द्रभिचपोर्नुं च । सरस्वतीकण्ठाभरण २-१-१२४

His Vṛtti on the same runs as follows :

आभ्यामूप्रत्ययो नुमागमश्च भवति । चम्पूः सर्पजातिः चम्पूः कथा ।

Nandakiśora Śarmā paraphrases the explanation of Bhoja in the following words without mentioning the source—

गत्यर्थकाच्चोरादिकाच्चपिधातोरुप्रत्यये विहिते चम्पयति चम्पतीति निष्पन्न-चम्पूशब्द ।[1]

Neither Bhoja nor Nandakiśora Śarmā attempts to bring out the propriety of the term as applied to campū, the mixed type of composition. One Haridāsa Bhaṭṭacārya quoted by *NANDA-KIŚORA ŚARMĀ* in his introduction to the *Ānandakandacampū* derives the word as –

चमत्कृत्य पुनाति सहृदयान्विस्मितिकृत्य प्रसादयतीति चम्पूः ।[2]

This derivation only reminds one of fantastic etymologies of the Brāhmaṇas and does not deserve much consideration.

Derivation of the word campū has proved a baffling task to modern Sanskrit scholars. Monier Williams in his Dictionary and Sir Rāja Rādhākantadeva Bahadur in his *Sabdakalpadruma* observe silence on the etymology of this word, though they profess on the title pages of their respective works to give the etymology of every word.

According to Winternitz 'Der Ausdruck campū ist nicht erclärt'[3] "Keith calls it 'a name of unknown sense'—[4] *To Dr. S.K. DE* the word is of obscure origin[5] *M. Louis Renou* says "Le terms est obscur.[6] *Dr. R.S. Mugali*, a Kannada Scholar and critic ridicules the attempts at finding out the etymology of the word from Sanskrit sources.[7] In his opinion the word campū can be derived

1. Introduction to *the Nalacampū*, p. 6 and to *the Ānandakanda-champū*, p. 1.
2. p. 1. fn.
3. Geschitche der indische Literatur , Dritter Band, p., 374.
4. History of Sanskrit Literature, p. 332.
5. History of Sanskrit Literature p. 433.
6. L' Inde Classique. Tome III p. 258.
7. Campūvina Mūla (Kannaḍa) Kannaḍa Sāhitya Pariṣat Patrika Bangalore, Vol. XXVI No. 1. The Heritage of Karnaṭaka, Bangalore 1946, p. 191. The Poona University Journal Jñāna Khaṇḍa, 1955, p. 102.

from Kannaḍa Kan Can meaning an exclamation of approval. He suggests that when compositions of this type were first recited, the appreciative audience could not help applauding enthusiastically and hence the new kind of composition came to be known as Kampū or campū. But the audience could not have surely remained cold when a good drama was staged or a beautiful canto of some Mahākāvya was recited. It must have applauded equally enthusiastically. How is it that only the mixed type of composition came to be specially associated with the applause and got its name through it?

Prof. D.R. Bendre, the renowned Kannada poet and dramatist, quoted by Dr. Mugali in his articles holds that the word campū is to be derived from the Tulu words Sampu and Campecampe meaning mixed and beautiful.

This etymology explains the reason why the form campū was specially associated with the word in question and helps to surmount the difficulty encountered in DR. Mugali's theory. Prof. Bendre's etymology would have been accepted if it was really impossible to derive the word from Sanskrit sources.

No scholar has noticed Bhoja's derivation of the word campū. There is no objection to accept it except that it is not clear how this word applies to this particular from of composition.

The difficulty is only apparent. It is possible to give satisfactory explanation of the term.

There are three roots 'cap' belonging to two conjugations according to the Dhātupāṭha of Paṇini. They are 'capa sāntvane' (1st conju) 'Capi gatyām' (10th Conjugation) and 'caha parikalkane capa ityake' (10th Conjugation) numbers 399, 1620 and 1697 respectively according to the Dhatupāṭha. The word campū can be derived from any of these three roots.

(I) Capa sāntvane. The campū form came into existence because (in the eloquent words of Dr. S.K. De) 'the impossible prose form with its superfluously ornamented and interminably prolonged sentences never appealed widely to later taste'.[1] Dhanapala the author of the *Tilakamañjarī* says—

1. History of Sanskrit literature, Classical Period p. 40.

अशान्तगद्यसन्ताना श्रोतृणां निर्विदे कथा ।
(तिलकमञ्जरी पृ० २ श्लो० १७)

and in a clever couplet the same author tells us :—

अखण्डदण्डकारण्यभाजः प्रचुरवर्णकात्
व्याघ्रादिव समाघ्रातो गद्याद् व्यावर्तते जनः ।
(तिलकमञ्जरी पृ० २ श्लो० ६५)

'People run away from a prose work as they do from a tiger, the prose work bristling with a multitude of lengthy and sonorous passeges and the tiger staying always in the Daṇḍaka forest and having many spots on its body.'

Introduction of prose passages must have given breathing time to the readers and must have greatly relieved their strain and broken the monotony. This new fashion must have brought a good deal of consolation to the poor readers who must have almost lost patience with the formidable prose works. So the root Capa Śāntvane may be at the origin of the word campū.

(ii) Capi gatyām. As pointed out by Nandakiśora Śarmā,[1] the word campu can be derived from this root also. As we shall see later on,[2] there is no 'gati' or movement in any campū. All campūs have been written in a leisurely style stopping at every step either to give minute descriptions of every conceivable object or to play acrobatics with words for which the flexible Sanskrit language provides abundant opportunities. The plot generally serves the purpose of supplying the author with chances to make a display of his verbal ingenuity and hence it is relegated to a subordinate position. Thus there being no movement (gati) in campū why should it be connected with this root ?

We would like to suggest the following explanation.

Gati is motion. It is in fact change of position. It will not be taking too much liberty with the word if the word gati is understood in the sense of transit or in the restricted sence of change. In a campū there is a constant transit or change from prose to verse and verse to prose hence it is properly so called.

1. Op. Cit. p. 22.
2. In Ch. VIII of this book.

(iii) 'Caha parikalkane capa ityeke.' As has been already shown campū is not only a mixture of prose and verse but (to borrow a term from Chemistry), a compound of the two ; for the ingredients of a mixture can be easily seperated, those of a compound cannot. Prose and verse are interwoven in campū like warp and woof without any special function being entrusted to either. It is impossible to seperate the two without affecting the continuity of the plot. The 'Kalka' preparation in the Ayurveda is a well known production in which the ingredients are very finely pounded together until it becomes impossible to seperate them. So etymology of the word campū from the root 'capa parikalkane' admirably brings out the peculiar characteristic of this form of composition.

Anticipating the argument that the root 'capa' is not of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit and hence attempts to drive the word campū from it do not appear plausible, we may point out that there do exist in Sanskrit words that can be traced to the root 'Cap' belonging to one conjugation or another.

The word 'Campaka' a sort of fragrant flower, can be derived from the root 'Capa sāntvane' The fragrant campaka flower exhilerates the person smelling it and hence properly so called.

The word capala meaning active or nimble is clearly a descendant of the root 'Capi Gatyām' The word Cāpa, a bow is clearly derived from this same root.

चपयति चापयति वा शरमिति चापः ।

is quite a satisfactory explanation.

'Capa parikalkane' is certainly the father of the word Capetā, a blow. Also of cipita, beaten rice.

Hence words derived from the root 'Cap' belonging to these two conjugations being available in Sanskrit the objection does not stand.

After all this discussion, we may be allowed to point out that one should not always insist on finding out the etymology of each and every word to be met with. Though some grammarians headed by Śākaṭāyana hold that every word is 'yaugika' i.e. one the etymology of which can be satisfactorily traced, other recognise both 'Yaugika' and 'rūḍha' words. Even in the case of some words, the

etymology of which can be found out, efforts to do so are not much fruitful e.g. The word Vyāghra can be derived as :—

विशेषेण आजिघ्रतीति व्याघ्रः ।

but a Vyāghra does not stop at smelling profusely So also is the case with the etymological meanings of the words Taila, Maṇḍapa, Dvirepha, Go etc.

In the opinion of Hemacandra :—

कुशलद्विरेफद्विकादयस्तु साक्षात्सङ्केतविषयत्वान्मुख्या एवेति न रूढिर्लक्ष्यस्यर्थस्य हेतुत्वेनास्माभिरुक्ता ।

(काव्यानुशासन अ० १ पृ० २५)

Viśvanātha observes in his Sāhityadarpaṇa :—

अन्यद्धि शब्दानां व्युत्पत्तिनिमित्तमन्यच्च प्रवृत्तिनिमित्तम् ।

(साहित्यदर्पण २)

The Sarvadarśanasaṅgraha holds[1] :—

न च व्युत्पत्तिबलादेव सर्वत्र शब्दः प्रवर्तते ।

Can anybody aspire after explaining etymologies of the numerous technical terms used by Pāṇini in his Aṣṭādhyayī ?

It is possible to take the word campū as a technical name for a peculiar kind of composition in which there is an admixture of prose and verse.

THE PURPOSE OF WRITING CAMPŪS

'Providing relief to the reader by means of variety of expression appears to be the main purpose behind the composition of campūs. Prose romances abounding in enormous passages with huge compounds taxed the reader's patience. Dhanapāla says in the Tilakamañjarī :

अश्रान्तगद्यसन्ताना श्रोतॄणां निर्विदे कथा । १७-१, २

There was not much life left in metrical works, which becomes extremely elaborate and artificial, in fact a means in the author's hands to make a show of his ingenuity in twisting and manipulating the language and playing verbal acrobatics in the forms of various Bandhas. As noted before alteration of prose and verse must have

1. Published by the BORI Poona.

been intended to provide a sort of breathing time to the readers ; and this new fashion must have been welcomed by them.

The campū authors have themselves clearly stated this purpose in so many word e.g. Haricandra (presumably belonging to the 10th Cent. A.D.) says in his *Jivandharacampū*

गद्यावलिः पद्यपरम्परा च
प्रत्येकमप्यावहति प्रमोदम् ।
हर्षप्रकर्षं तनुते मिलित्वा
द्राग्बाल्यतारुण्यवतीव कान्ता ॥ १-९

Soḍḍhala (11th Cent. A.D.) in the introductory chapter of his *Udayasundarīkathā* explains why he resorted to this—particular form of composition in preference to mere prose or mere verse. As he puts it poetically—

प्रक्रमे तु न नाम केवलं गद्यं नापि केवलं पद्यमुभयानुबन्धिनी चम्पूरेव श्रेयसी । यस्मादन्यैव रत्नैर्विपञ्चितस्य शोभा कनकभूषणस्य अन्यदेव पाटलामिश्रितस्य सौरभं विचिकिलगुलुच्छस्यः अन्य एव वंशछवनिगर्भितस्य मनोहारिमा गीतस्य, अन्यदेव कर्पूरमीलितस्य शैत्यं मलयजद्रवस्य अन्यैव च हृद्यता पद्यानुषङ्गिणो गद्यस्य ।

(उदयसुन्दरीकथा, १ पृ० १३)

Bhoja (11th Cent. A.D.) another great campū author gives the same reason.

गद्यानुबन्धरसमिश्रितपद्यसूक्ति—
र्हृद्या हि वाद्यकलया कलितेव गीतिः ।
तस्माद्धातु कविमार्गजुषां सुखाय
चम्पूप्रबन्धरचनां रसना मदीया ॥

(रामायणचम्पू १-३ पृ० ४)

Veṅkatādhvarin the author of the *Viśwaguṇādarśacampū* (17th Cent. A.D.) agrees with this raison detre for this composition and in a very melodious verse gives his support thus—

पद्यं यद्यपि विद्यते बहु सतां हृद्यं विगद्यं न तद्
गद्यं च प्रतिपद्यते न विजहत्पद्यं बुधास्वाद्यताम्
आदत्ते च तयोः प्रयोग उभयोरामोदभूमोदयं
सङ्गः कस्य हि न स्वदेत मनसे माध्वीकमृद्वीकयोः ॥

(विश्वगुणादर्श श्लो० ४)

been intended to provide a sort of breathing time to the readers ; and this new fashion must have been welcomed by them.

The campū authors have themselves clearly stated this purpose in so many word e.g. Haricandra (presumably belonging to the 10th Cent. A.D.) says in his *Jīvandharacampū*

गद्यावलिः पद्यपरम्परा च
प्रत्येकमप्यावहति प्रमोदम् ।
हर्षप्रकर्षं तनुते मिलित्वा
द्राग्बाल्यतारुण्यवतीव कान्ता ॥ १-९

Soḍḍhala (11th Cent. A.D.) in the introductory chapter of his *Udayasundarīkathā* explains why he resorted to this—particular form of composition in preference to mere prose or mere verse. As he puts it poetically—

प्रक्रमे तु न नाम केवलं गद्यं नापि केवलं पद्यमुभयानुबन्धिनी चम्पूरेव श्रेयसी । यस्मादन्यैव रत्नैर्विपञ्चितस्य शोभा कनकभूषणस्य अन्यदेव पाटलामिश्रितस्य सौरभं विचिकिलगुलुच्छस्य: अन्य एव वंशध्वनिगर्भितस्य मनोहारिमा गीतस्य, अन्यदेव कर्पूरमीलितस्य शैत्यं मलयजद्रवस्य अन्यैव च हृद्यता पद्यानुषङ्गिणो गद्यस्य ।

(उदयसुन्दरीकथा, १ पृ० १३)

Bhoja (11th Cent. A.D.) another great campū author gives the same reason.

गद्यानुबन्धरसमिश्रितपद्यसूक्ति—
र्हृद्या हि वाद्यकलया कलितेव गीतिः ।
तस्माद्दधातु कविमार्गजुषां सुखाय
चम्पूप्रबन्धरचनां रसना मदीया ॥

(रामायणचम्पू १-३ पृ० ४)

Veṅkatādhvarin the author of the *Viśwaguṇādarśacampū* (17th Cent. A.D.) agrees with this raison detre for this composition and in a very melodious verse gives his support thus—

पद्यं यद्यपि विद्यते बहु सतां हृद्यं विगद्यं न तद्
गद्यं च प्रतिपद्यते न विजहत्पद्यं बुधास्वाद्यताम् ।
आदत्ते च तयोः प्रयोग उभयोरामोदभूमोदयं
सङ्गः कस्य हि न स्वदेत मनसे माध्वीकमृद्वीकयोः ॥

(विश्वगुणादर्श श्लो० ४)

This same has been paraphrased by Śarabhoji (alise Saraphoji) King of Tanjore (19th Cent. A.D.) in his *Kumārasaṁbhavacampū* in the following words :

पद्यं हृद्यमपीह गद्यरहितं धत्ते न हृद्यास्पदं
गद्यं पद्यविवर्जितं च भजते नास्वाद्यता मानसे ।
साहित्यं च तयोर्द्वयोरपि सुधामाध्वीकयोर्योगवत्
सन्तोषं हृदयाम्बुजे वितनुते साहित्यविद्याविदाम् ॥
(कुमारसम्भवचम्पू १ श्लो० ६)

Veṅkatarāghava, the author of the *Hayavadanavijayacampū* (19th Cent. A.D.) has the same idea in mind.

सद्गद्यपद्यमय एव हृदि प्रबन्धो
रत्नाञ्चितः कनकहार इवातिवेलम्
मोदं करोति विदुषां तदहं प्रबन्ध-
मेवंविधं विरचयन्नमदं करोमि ॥
(हयवदनविनयचम्पू १ श्लो० ८)

Another purpose that must have motivated the campū authors appears to be the desire to prove that they could write both prose and verse with equal skill. Prose was at one time considered the touchstone of poets[1]. On the other Land some authors like Bāṇa-bhaṭṭa were masters of prose style but they were not so much at home when it came to writing verses[2]. This was noticed by critics, and the great author of the finest Sanskrit prose was not spared from merciless criticism.

It is not impossible that some later authors were ambitious to establish their reputation as equally at home with prose and verse both. Perhaps through modesty, most of the campū authors have observed silence on this point, hut Aṇṇayārya (date unknown), the author of the *Tattvaguṇādarśacampū* has courage enough to declare—

नैके श्लोकाननेकान्विदधति कृतिनः श्रीकरास्तोत्रपाकान्
एके गद्यानि हृद्यान्यतिमधुरपदास्वाद्यपद्यानि चान्ये
पार्श्वाभिव्यक्तमुक्ताफलकलनकनत्पद्मरागोज्ज्वलस्रग्
बन्धच्छायानुबद्धं रचयति कविराडेष चम्पूप्रबन्धम् ॥

---

1. गद्यं कवीनां निकषं वदन्ति ।
2. यादृग्गद्यविधौ बाणः पद्यबन्धे न तादृशः ।

It cannot be said with certainty in which period the campū form originated though the earliest available specimens date from 10th Cent. A.D.[1] If it really came into existence in the decadent period of Sanskrit literature the following explanation may be given for its use :—

As a rule Sanskrit posts and dramatist show very little originality. They have mostly looked to *the Rāmāyaṇa* and *the Mahābhārata* for the plots for their composition. All that they had in mind while treating of their sources appears to be the literary embellishment of the original. Soon there was left no scope for later poets in this field also. So having no originality of conception, the later poets desired to achieve some novelty of execution. The practice of mixing together prose and verse had been current right from the Vedic days. The new campū authors tried to combine the best both from Mahākāvya and Gadyakāvya and campū came into being. How far they succeeded in their task will be judged in chapter VIII of this book.

It will be convenient to consider here to which use campūs were put. The Ānandalatikācampū of Kṛṣnanātha (17th cent. A.D.) was sung to King Cintāmaṇi by one Ānandaka in order to alleviate the former's grief at his daughter's departure for her husband's house *The Rādhāmādhavavilāsacampū* of Jayarāma (17th Cant. A.D.) was recited in the court of Śāhaji Bhonsala. *The Gaṇgācampū* of Śaṅkara Dikṣita (18th Cent. A.D.) mentions that people in Benaras used to teach and study campūs as they used to read Kathās, Ākhyāyikās, Kāvyās[2] etc. The Editor of the Journal of Travancore University Oriental Manuscripts Library[3] states that the campūs of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa (17th Cent. A.D.) were written with a definite aim, viz, to be used for Kuttu in the temples. Kuttu is an ancient cultural institution in Kerala consisting in the elucidation of Purānic stories in a humorous manner by Cakyars, the professional actors and reciters of Kerala, in temples during festive occasions.

---

1. This problem has been discussed in Ch. II of this book.
2. तत्र च मुहूर्तं विश्रम्यापराह्ण समये सत्काव्यनाटकप्रहसनाख्यायिकाचम्पूप्रबन्धादिकमध्यापयन्तो विविधकथा विलासैः कालमकालयन् । ७-२८, २९
3. Introduction to the Matsyāvatāraprabandha JTUOMSSL Vol.—I No. 2

THE SCOPE AND EXTENT OF CAMPŪ LITERATURE

Campūs have been written on a variety of subjects. *The Rāmāyaṇa* and *the Mahābhārata*, the two inexhaustible storehouses that have provided generations of Indian poets with subjects for their compositions have not failed to yield a rich harvest to campū authors also. Campūs have been written on each epic as a whole or on stray incidents from them. It is to be regretted, however, that no campū author has ever entertained an idea of visualizing the old stories in a new light. Attention has been concentrated only on finding out opportunities for displaying verbal jugglery or indulgiug in quaint ideas. The original serenity and sublimity of the *Rāmāyaṇa* and the vigour and realism of *the Mahābhārata* have very rarely, if at all, trickled into these adaptations of theirs.

Purāṇas, the popular treasures of religious stories have also been freely drawn upon. As a matter of fact, the greatest number of campūs (141 out of 390) has been composed on Purāṇa topics. The Bhāgavata Purāṇa, especially the Kṛṣṇa legend in it, has attracted a bigger number of authors than any other single source. Unfortunately, the Kṛṣṇa campūs dwell too much upon Kṛṣṇa's relations with Rādhā and other Gopīs and throw decency to the winds.

Jainas have employed the mixed style for narrating stories from their sacred books. As they could never think of taking any liberty with their texts, they have only concentrated on embellishing the plot and introducing all sorts of Jaina technical terms, Jaina teachings and misrepresentation of the Vedic religion.

Discussions about philosophical doctrines of various sects and their comparative worths form the subject matter of campūs like the *Vidvanmodataraṅgiṇī* of Cirañjīva Bhaṭṭācārya (18th Cent. A.D.).

The Mandārmaranda campū of Srīkṛṣṇa (Circa 1600 A.D.) and the Nṛsiṁha campū of Daivajñapaṇḍita Sūrya (16th Cent. A.D.) have been classified as rhetorical campūs. The former as a handbook of the Kaviśikṣā type, dealing with all the topics, the knowledge of which is necessary for a budding poet. The Nṛsiṁha-campū narrates the main story of the Man-lion incarnation in the

first two chapters and devotes the remaining chapters to delineate the nine sentiments that are said to have arisen in the minds of various individuals at the sight of Nṛsiṁha.

Some campūs have been written on historical personages by their proteges. In such campūs the heroes have been raised to the skies. The *Ānandaraṅgacampū* of Śrīnivāsa (18th Cent. A.D.) being a notorious example. Another class of poets has composed campūs on revered teachers like Śrī Saṅkarācārya, Rāmānujāçārya etc. Therein also the heroes have been much extolled, but the praise is not so revolting as in the case of campūs on the poets' patrons

The *Viśvaguṇādarśa* of Veṅkatādhvarin (17th Cent. A.D.) is a social campū revealing both the bright and dark sides of contemporary society. It has set the norm for other campūs of the type, which are its weak imitations. All such campūs have been classed as Social Campūs.

Yet other group of campūs is of the type of Sthalapurāṇas and describes some places of pilgrimage, famous temples etc. and recounts stories connected with them. Campūs containing description about pilgrimages undertaken by a hero and places visited by him also have been included under this head.

All the campūs that could not be included under any of the above nine heads are classed together as miscellaneous campūs. Campūs resembling prose romances like the *Udayasundarīkathā* of Soḍḍhala (11th Cent. A.D.), those based on fables like the *Vikramasenacaritacampū* of Narāyaṇa (18th cent A.D.) and on pure Love stories like the *Kotivirahcampū* of Nārāyaṇa Bhaṭṭa. (17th cent. A.D.) have been brought together in this group.

The following table will give an idea about the number of campūs known to be existing in each group :-

Group	No. of works available
1. Rāmāyaṇacampūs	63
2. Mahābhāratacampūs	47
3. Purāṇacampūs	141
4. Jaina campūs	8
5. Philosophical campūs	8
6. Rhetorical campūs	2
7. Historical campūs	59
8. Social campūs	3
9. Local campūs	38
10 Miscellaneous campūs	14
11. Doubtful campūs	11
Minus campūs counted twice.	4
Total	390